



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,918	07/05/2005	Todd Stout	67101-002	2982
<div>26/096 7590 06/01/2010 CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD SUITE 350 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009</div>				
EXAMINER				
ASTORINO, MICHAEL C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3769				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/01/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/524,918		Applicant(s) STOUT, TODD	
	Examiner Michael C. Astorino		Art Unit 3769	

All Participants:

(1) Michael C. Astorino.

(2) Karin Butchko.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Prior art rejection under Epler et al. US Patent Number 7,024,370

Claims discussed:
Pending claims 18, 47-89, and 91.

Prior art documents discussed:
Epler et al. US Patent Number 7,024,370

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Michael C. Astorino/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3769

Status of Application: Pending, before Final Office Action

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant's representative to discuss Epler et al. The Examiner identified and explained Epler et al. in detail. The participants discussed reasonability of interpretations of Epler et al. and distinguishing characteristics between Epler et al. and the present application. Proposals to overcome Epler et al. included swearing behind the reference or adding additional limitations into the claims. However, the Applicant disagreed with the reasonability of the examiner's interpretation of Epler et al.'s disclosure. The Examiner discussed the possibility of later discussing the reference and the claims after the office action was mailed out. Additionally the examiner mentioned the benefit of having the inventors in the present application review the references and identify distinguishing characteristics between the reference and the applicant's invention.